

1 May 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

**SUBJECT: Meeting with General Carroll and General Fitch on
DIA Programs and Budget**

1. I called on General Carroll in his office on 30 April to discuss the DIA budget. General Fitch was also present. I showed them copies of the Bureau of the Budget's letter of 14 April soliciting the Director's views about future trends in the Intelligence Community budget. I said that I had discussed the letter with the Director, pointing out that it would be difficult for the DCI to express very definitive views about future budget levels of the programs under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense until various reviews, notably the CCP and the CIP, had been concluded by the responsible component of the Defense Department. I also pointed out that as yet no review of the NRP had even been initiated. I said that I had told the DCI that arrangements for participating in both the CCP and the CIP were satisfactory. As far as the CCP is concerned, actual representation is by Mr. [redacted] who represents the Agency. This review, however, will be supplemented by the requirements review being conducted by [redacted] and the Early Warning review being conducted by [redacted]. As a result of these three reviews, the Director will have developed sufficient information to provide the basis of an independent judgement. (At the moment, we have taken the position that there is no need for a DCI representative as such to participate in the development of the CCP as such.)

2. As regards the CIP, I had told the Director that [redacted] had worked out arrangements which should provide an adequate basis for observations for the development of an independent judgement. I explained to General Carroll that the Director had then called Secretary Vance and communicated all of the foregoing statements to him, who had suggested that I talk to Mr. Hitch.

25X1

about the problem of answering the Bureau of the Budget letter and also generally about the problem of adequate participation by representatives of the DCI in the development of intelligence programs in DOD.

3. I told General Carroll about my earlier conversation with Mr. Hitch. I went on to say that I wanted assurance from him that I had been correct in advising the DCI and the Deputy Secretary that arrangements for participation in the development of the CIP were adequate and satisfactory, both from his point of view and from our own. I said that I understood that the Service submissions would be reviewed in DIA in the reasonably near future and that the DIA compilation would then be subject to review by elements of the Defense Department and Bureau of the Budget before submission to the Secretary of Defense. I asked General Carroll at what point the Joint Chiefs of Staff were consulted on the CIP. He produced a diagram which had just been completed which shows the presentation more or less as follows. Service submissions are reviewed, assembled and approved by General Carroll. They do not expect to complete this process until 1 June. The program is then submitted to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to a committee in the Defense Department simultaneously. The Joint Chiefs forward the program to the Secretary of Defense directly with their comments and recommendations for modification, if any. A committee in the Defense Department, chaired by General Carroll with membership from the DDR&E, the Comptroller's office, Manpower and also from the Bureau of the Budget, reviews the CIP independently and forwards the program with their recommendations to the Secretary of Defense. It is at that point that General Carroll believes that participation by a representative of the DCI would be appropriate.

4. There followed a rather long discussion of the functions and responsibilities of the DCI. I pointed out that it was essential for the DCI to have the information necessary to establish an independent judgement on significant aspects of the entire Intelligence Community program. On one hand, he is not in the position of a manager and is not concerned with details of administration. Or

25X1

the other hand, he is concerned with the allocation of resources and measures calculated to increase the over-all efficiency of the Community as a whole. For this purpose, it is necessary for him to know in reasonable depth the details and status of individual programs of all components of the Community. I said that I felt that [redacted] should familiarize himself with the details of Service submissions so that he would be able to ensure some understanding on the part of the Director of the specific resources available at an operational level. I said that I also hoped that

[redacted] would be able to help in the development of a form of presentation and the establishment of categories which could ultimately serve as a basis for a presentation of programs of the Intelligence Community as a whole. General Fitch pointed out that the CIA form of presentation was entirely different from the form required by the Defense Department. I said that there is no reason why we couldn't change the CIA form and in any event for their own internal management purposes, DIA would have to develop categories which inevitably would be substantially similar to those used by the Agency. [redacted]

25X1

5. Both General Carroll and General Fitch rather resisted the idea of participation in the CIP prior to its submission to the DOD committee. I said that this is entirely up to them; that I was anxious to avoid the imposition of any administrative burden. General Carroll suggested at one point to have an outsider around at the time that all this paper was being reviewed would be unduly onerous and they were not in a position to brief representatives of the DCI's staff on the individual Service submissions which are voluminous, inaccurate and in many instances totally inadmissible. I repeated that we had no desire for special briefings, that in fact this was one of the things we were anxious to avoid. On the other hand, as a matter of principle, I felt strongly that the DCI was entitled to access to submissions and statements of requirements of the individual Services before review and consolidation by the DIA. General Carroll said that there was in his mind no question of the DCI's right to access to submissions by the Services.

25X1

6. At this point, I repeated that [redacted]
[redacted] had had some informal discussions and my understanding
was that the arrangements which they proposed were adequate from
my point of view and administratively feasible from their point of
view. I told General Carroll that I had planned to come around and
discuss these anyway. In view of the conversation between the DCI
and Secretary Vance, I wanted to be sure that he was fully aware
of these arrangements now.

25X1

25X1

7. General Carroll suggested that [redacted] come
in and he joined in the conversation as we were reviewing some of
the difficulties of making the DOD submissions conform to the
intelligence categories used in CIA. I recapitulated the problem
as I saw it for [redacted] benefit. He rather got the idea
that General Carroll is opposed to any participation by a DCI
representative prior to the submission of the program to the DOD
group. He therefore strongly urged that representation be limited
to the period beginning with 1 June, at which point participation
by the DCI representative along with everybody else, he thought,
would be in order. I said that I tended to agree that formal rep-
resentation by the DCI beginning with the review at the DOD level
would be adequate. On the other hand, I felt that the DCI repres-
entative should not appear at these meetings cold and that he should
have the benefit of an opportunity to familiarize himself with the
Service submissions so that he could be educated to some degree
about the problem. General Carroll inferred that the proposal to
limit attendance to the DOD review would follow the precedent
of the CCP. I pointed out that the difference was that the CIA
representative on the CCP had the benefit of 20 years' experience
with the SIGINT program whereas now no one has much experience
with any part of the CIP. Both General Carroll and General Fitch
concurred in this thought. [redacted] suggested that we
could familiarize ourselves adequately by reviewing last year's
CIP and be prepared to address ourselves to changes in the new CIP.
I gave this idea a very cold shoulder and [redacted] admitted
that the CIP last year was less than a revealing document.

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

8. We finally left it that [redacted] would have another talk and see whether arrangements were in fact practical and generally conformed to the principles which we enumerated above. I told General Carroll that if on reflection he had any reason to disapprove of the arrangement proposed, please to say so. He said that were we in any way displeased with the arrangements, please to advise him.

9. Perhaps the matter of most importance was the very definite agreement in principle on the part of both General Carroll and General Fitch to the proposition that the DCI is entitled to access to information contained in Service proposals to the DIA, in their original form prior to review and consolidation by DIA into the CIP.

(s) John A. Gross

JOHN A. GROSS
D/DCI/NIPE

Distribution:

Orig - DCI/NIPE

1

1

1

[redacted]

Addition points made during my meeting of 30 April with Generals Carroll and Fitch on participation and preparation of the CIP are as follows:

1. I stressed the fact that while the Director's responsibilities for intelligence programs and activities of DOD are less than that of management, they go beyond the mere statement of requirements. Anybody can formulate requirements. The problem is to develop programs which are reasonably calculated to satisfy requirements. The DCI must necessarily be concerned with whether it is worthwhile using money and manpower on a particular program on the basis of (a) the relative priority of the objective to be obtained, and (b) the relative probability of achieving success. Both Generals Carroll and Fitch agreed with this.

2. General Fitch suggested that, rather than participate actively in the development of the DIA program during the budget cycle, that the DCI representatives might better address themselves to reviews of the CCP, CIP, etc., some time in the late summer or fall with a view to developing proposals for improvements and changes in next year's cycle. I said that this was certainly a desirable step and one which we would try to take anyway. On the other hand, issues are developed and decisions taken in the course of program review sessions which are difficult to change. Moreover it is only in the context of specific decisions relating to budgets and program approvals, etc., that, as a practical matter, the real facts and problems relating to a great many situations are fully revealed. If the DCI is only going to look at requirements [REDACTED] only going to review programs which have already been approved, he will soon be relegated to a seat in the bleachers, and a rather remote one at that.

3. I said that the Bureau of the Budget was apparently going to brief Clark Clifford some time in June on the whole Community budget. Apparently the Bureau of the Budget proposes to use the Director's letter for this purpose.

4. Although the opposition to [REDACTED] participation in the review of the CIP prior to its approval by General Carroll was

25X1

almost entirely predicated on administrative considerations (the confusion of an added participant, one more man to be briefed, etc., etc.), General Carroll stated at one point that they could not tolerate the use of material in Service presentations by the DCI for the purpose of briefing the Bureau of the Budget or other people before decisions had been made by DIA itself. I told General Carroll that we were fully aware of this problem and completely agreed with his concern. I told him that we would not use material which came to our attention during the course of the program reviews before a DIA position had been approved by him. It seems to me that this, rather than administrative considerations, is the real reason for his hesitation.

JOHN A. BROSS
D/DCI/NIPE